

**LARKSPUR CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 6, 2008**

CITY COUNCIL: PRESENT: Mayor Kathy Hartzell, Ron Arlas, Larry Chu,
Dan Hillmer, Joan Lundstrom

STAFF: PRESENT: City Manager Jean Bonander, City Attorney
Sky Woodruff, Public Works Director Hamid
Shamsapour, Recreation Director David
Wilkinson

Mayor Hartzell called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

The City Clerk certifies that this Agenda has been posted in accordance with the requirements of the Government Code

Approval of Warrants

Approval of Minutes: January 26, 2008

Adopt Ordinance No. 943, An Ordinance Amending Chapter 15 of the City of Larkspur Municipal Code Pertaining to the Reduction of Air Pollution by Regulating the Installation of Wood Burning Appliances and the Removal of Non-Certified Wood Burning Appliances

Adopt Resolution No. 03/08, Changes to the City Council Operating Principles of Conduct

M/s, Lundstrom/Arlas and approved 5-0 to approve the Consent Calendar as submitted.

CITY MANAGER'S ORAL REPORT

The City Manager reported the Council tentatively scheduled a Special Meeting with the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) Board of Directors for February 13th but the SMART General Manager has been unable to confirm their attendance.

It will probably need to be cancelled and she would contact the Council sometime tomorrow. Staff would try to reschedule a meeting in March. She is trying to schedule a short, morning meeting of the Twin Cities Police Council either February 13th or 14th.

The Ross Valley Sanitary District Board approved the letter of agreement with Campus Properties and testing of the soil at the 2000 Larkspur Landing project will start tomorrow. They hope to have some preliminary findings within 60 days. The Greenbrae/Highway 101/Twin Cities Corridor Project Workshop has been rescheduled for March 8th. The project manager plans to come back to the Council on March 19th for final comments before they take the project to the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) Board of Directors. The city managers of Marin plan to meet with PG&E on February 19th to discuss storm related customer service issues. She, along with the Mayor, has been invited to the February 26th Greenbrae Property Owner's Association meeting. Staff has been approached by the AT&T Light Speed Team to discuss their plans for infrastructure improvements throughout Larkspur. These plans include the placement of structures that would house fiber optic systems.

There are issues related to the regulation of telecommunications providers, along with permits for Design Review, etc. Councilmember Hillmer discussed his experience on the Marin Telecommunications Agency (MTA) and offered his assistance in this matter. Councilmember Chu stated the structures are about six feet high and sit on a 4 X 6 concrete pad and are placed in the public right-of-way. They are spaced about 600 feet apart. The City Manager stated most of the structures would be placed on major thoroughfares and would be highly visible. Councilmember Hillmer stated the issues (visual, CEQA requirements, etc.) have been flagged by the MTA.

COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

Mayor Hartzell displayed two of the Centennial banners that would be installed on light poles throughout Larkspur.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Rick Adler, William Avenue, urged the Council to establish an Environmental Protection Commission along with a paid staff person. He stated there is much expertise in the community.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. CITYWIDE TREE REPLACEMENT PLAN AND HISTORIC DOWNTOWN BEAUTIFICATION

The Public Works Director presented the staff report. He introduced Ms. Cordelia Hill, representing Royston, Hanamoto, Alley & Abbey Landscape Architects.

Ms. Hill made a Powerpoint presentation that included: 1) Tree planning program; 2) Tree Planting Concepts; 3) Trees; 4) Tree guards and grates; 5) Engineered soil. She stated Phase One would include the replacement of the seven trees that have been removed plus the addition of ten additional trees where none now exist. The locations have been determined by walking Magnolia Avenue and identifying areas that would not be in conflict with view lines or utilities. Future phasing would include the replacement of trees that fail. The concept includes using the existing Redwoods as the gateway statement at the north and south ends of the downtown areas. Immediately adjacent to the redwood trees staff is proposing the use of Crape Myrtle as the framing tree. The Water Gum would be used as the core tree to replace the existing Carob trees as they fail. The Crape Myrtle was selected for its flowers and nice shape in the winter. It will lose its leaves for a brief period of time. The Water Gum has much the same character as the Carob but fewer problems. They are recommending the use of a grate at the base of the trees and a guard around the trees. They are also recommending the use of a specially engineered soil that would allow the roots to grow and would prevent upheaving of the sidewalks. The cost estimates in areas where there is no existing tree would be approximately \$11,000. This includes the tree, the grate, the guard, and the engineered soil. The cost for Phase One would be about \$225,000. She stated funding options included the creation of an assessment district, fund raising efforts, an "Adopt a Tree Program", a possible Street Tree Grant Program.

Councilmember Lundstrom asked if the Heritage Preservation Board had reviewed the plan. The Public Works Director stated staff did not take this plan back to the board since it is very similar to the one they have previously reviewed.

Councilmember Lundstrom referred to the funding recommendations and she asked if a fifth category, City Funding, had been considered for tree installation. The City Manager stated "yes" and there are a couple of directions they can go. Many communities have an assessment district or Business Improvement District that can be established in conjunction with the City. There is an ordinance in place that transfers risk and assignment of street trees and other structures to adjacent property owners.

However, staff did not feel this was an appropriate venue to use in the downtown area since it is utilized by more than just the property owners. Street trees are a part of the Historic Downtown and the community as a whole. Staff could look at the Capital Improvements Budget and the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) Fund. She noted there could be a phased approach to Phase One. Councilmember Lundstrom stated the Council had previously discussed using the TOT Funds for tree installation.

Mayor Hartzell asked about the possibility of installing bike racks and some modifications to the trash receptacles in the downtown area. Ms. Hill stated there

is a trash receptacle that is made by the same company and she could provide photographs to staff. There are also some attractive bike racks. The City Manager noted the plan identified some locations for bike racks and she asked Ms. Hill to point those out.

Mayor Hartzell opened the meeting to public comments.

Mr. Bill Howard, Meadowood Drive, stated he was very surprised at the cost of the project. He stated it appeared the burden would be on a small number of property owners to beautify the downtown. There seemed to be big gaps in the plan and he noted there were no trees proposed for the west side of Magnolia Avenue. He pointed to his property and stated the plan called for two trees and he would not be willing to pay \$20,000. He asked if the City would share in the cost of repairing the sidewalks and replacing the trees. The cost of this plan is prohibitive.

Mr. Dennis Gilardi, Hawthorne Avenue, stated he remodeled 484 Magnolia Avenue and put in two low-income housing units. The tree in front of the building had to be removed to install the new fire-safety water line for the sprinklers. He agreed, as a part of the remodeling, to replace the tree. The City is responsible, as the owner of the sidewalk, to demonstrate that the replacement tree will not provide root invasion and lift the sidewalk. The existing street trees had 50% of their roots removed when the street was rebuilt a number of years ago. He is skeptical about whether the proposed root barrier would work and stated the City should take responsibility. There is not a lot of room for the roots to grow because the utility lines are located underneath the sidewalks.

Ms. Hill discussed the engineered soil that is being recommended. She stated it has been used for about 25 years with much success. The mix has "spaces" in it that allows the roots to grow in a much wider area. She noted there were no trees proposed for the west side of Magnolia Avenue due to the overhead structure and the large water stream that runs under the sidewalk. Mr. Howard stated the drain under the street drops down to a 36" pipe; it is not a big drainage swale as has been asserted in the past. There is room for a tree even under the overhead structures.

Ms. Sallyanne Wilson, Walnut Avenue, member of the Heritage Preservation Board, stated the plan is consistent with their recommendations. She stated there is a need for more trees in the downtown area. She is in favor of the recommendation for the grates and the guards. The costs should be incurred by more than just the property owners since the downtown area benefits the entire community. She noted the project seems very expensive.

Ms. Debbie Misewinkle, San Francisco, stated the design looks heavily concentrated in one area and it would not be very attractive. She asked if the bike racks were included in the prior plan. Ms. Hill stated they were recently

added to the plan. Ms. Misewinkle was concerned about having another structure in the public right-of-way.

Mr. James Holmes, Madrone Avenue, referred to Mr. Howard's comments and stated there should be additional investigation into whether or not trees would be possible in the west part of Magnolia Avenue. He stated trees were a vital asset and efforts should be made for cost sharing beyond the property owners.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated she was told many years ago that trees could not be planted in the west part of Magnolia Avenue (in front of Rainbow Market and Red Robin Caterers) due to the underground utilities and the sewer laterals.

Mr. Gary Rulli, Magnolia Avenue, asked if there was any leeway (2-3 feet) in terms of the location of the trees. Ms. Hill stated the tree placement was based on a site walk and an attempt to have them approximately 25' on center. They are located in between utilities and laterals. Some of the gaps have to do with driveways. The Public Works Director stated they are proposing a total number of 17 trees but they could eliminate a few for aesthetic reasons. He added it was not possible to plant any trees in front of Red Robin and Rainbow Market because of the culvert, the utilities, and the overhang.

Mayor Hartzell asked about the composition of the sewer laterals. The Public Works Director stated they used to be made of clay but the current material is PVC or cast iron.

Ms. Margaret von Treskow, Magnolia Avenue, stated the downtown looks very ugly due to the lack of trees. She was concerned about any assessment and stated she could not afford it. She stated the downtown area was enjoyed by everyone and she resented the fact that the property owners would have to bear the financial burden. She asked if she was responsible for the utility box on her property.

Ms. Kathryn Arrow, Baltimore Avenue, asked if an assessment would include only the businesses that have trees on their property. Councilmember Hillmer stated it has not been developed. Ms. Arrow stated the cost should be shared by all of the merchants. She asked who would be responsible for the on-going maintenance of the trees. Mayor Hartzell stated that would be discussed by the Council. Ms. Arrow stated the cost seemed very high. Ms. Arrow asked if volunteers could be used to bring the cost down.

Mr. Rick Adler, William Avenue, suggested some planter boxes in the areas where trees could not be planted.

Mayor Hartzell closed the meeting to public comments.

The Public Works Director stated the current ordinance states that property owners are responsible for maintenance of trees and sidewalks. The utility boxes are part of the sidewalk. The utility company will replace the box but the cost of the labor is the property owner's responsibility.

Councilmember Hillmer stated they were trying to implement a process for replacing these trees and relieve some anxiety on the part of the property owners. If the Council decides to share in the cost of this project he would want to know the cost of repairing utility boxes. The Public Works Director stated there were about a half dozen locations. Councilmember Hillmer asked if this was included in the current cost description. The Public Works Director stated only if the tree was located right next to a utility box.

Councilmember Chu stated the City ordinance pertaining to responsibility of maintaining sidewalks was taken from the California Streets and Highways Code and the discussion centered on residential projects. He was not sure he wanted to ask the downtown property owners to take full responsibility for the public right-of-way. The City Attorney stated the State Code allows cities to shift maintenance responsibilities to adjacent property owners and it does not differentiate between private and commercial property. Given that there are factors affecting street trees in commercial corridors that are not applicable to residential areas, there are a number of reasons that the City could choose to offset some or all of the cost of the trees in a commercial area.

Mayor Hartzell referred to page 6 of the staff report, #1, "List of Recommended Tree Species", and asked for comments.

It was the consensus of the Council to approve the list.

Mayor Hartzell referred to page 6 of the staff report, #2, "Historic Downtown Area", and asked for comments.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated they are looking at a concept and how it is phased, etc. is the second step in the process. They should work with the property owners in terms of exact locations. She would like to see consideration of some type of vegetation near the Rainbow Market and Red Robin Caterers location.

Councilmember Hillmer stated the overall goal for Larkspur should be to maximize the number of trees to achieve shading, aesthetics, etc. They should attempt to minimize conflicts with utilities and attempt to find a way to place some trees on the west side of Magnolia Avenue. This is a special enough project to warrant City participation.

Councilmember Chu agreed with the comments made by Councilmembers Lundstrom and Hillmer.

Councilmember Arlas stated he agreed with Councilmember Hillmer and stated this was an expensive project and it deserved City participation. He stated the project should be phased in according to the available funding.

Mayor Hartzell stated she agreed with the comments made but stated the plan does not address long term maintenance and trimming. The carobs have become oddly shaped and she would like to see more of the architecture of the buildings. She would like staff to continue to examine the spacing of the trees since there seemed to be some gaps.

Mayor Hartzell asked for comments about funding.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated the two issues related to funding were the installation and the maintenance of the trees. She would recommend that the City provide the funding for the installation of the trees since it is a public benefit. She asked staff to look at the TOT Fund, Capital Improvement Budget, and any applicable grants. She asked if the City currently maintained the trees. The Public Works Director stated "yes". Councilmember Lundstrom stated the sidewalks were privately owned and she did not want the City to maintain the sidewalks. She would like the City to continue to maintain (trim) the trees.

Councilmember Hillmer asked staff to flesh out all the costs discussed tonight as a part of the total project cost.

The City Manager stated the key issue on the funding side was to what extent the Council would like to cost share, if at all. She stated they may not end up doing everything shown in the plan and she stated staff would come back with a short-term plan. A Business Improvement District is a formal arrangement where all property owners come together with fees or funding to do a variety of things that contribute to the enhancement of the downtown shopping district. Its intent is to share some common costs. Councilmember Arlas asked if the City could impose this type of arrangement. The City Attorney stated it was typically created through a ballot procedure through the merchants and payment is through the renewal of the Business License Tax. The District Board consists of the merchants who prepare an annual budget, a program of what they want to do the next year, and a plan on how to spend the money. The City Council approves the assessment and the budget.

Councilmember Chu stated he agreed with Councilmember Lundstrom and felt the implementation costs should be paid by the City. He noted there might be some surplus of Centennial Funds. Mayor Hartzell stated any surplus would be going towards the Disaster Preparedness Program. Councilmember Chu stated the City should trim the trees.

M/s, Lundstrom/Arlas and approved 5-0 that the City take the responsibility for the funding, which could come from a number of different sources, for the installation of street trees in the Historic Downtown as outlined in the concept plan prepared by Royston, Hanamoto, Alley & Abbey and that the City continue to trim and prune these trees.

The Council took a 10-minute break at 9:10 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:20 p.m.

2. REVISION TO THE HERITAGE TREE ORDINANCE

The Recreation Director presented the staff report. He noted the Fire Chief indicated he would like the section pertaining to “pyrophytic trees” removed since it is often exploited by property owners.

Councilmember Chu stated referred to Section 12.16.080, “Procedure for Removal of Heritage Trees” (F) and stated he would prefer to see the report prepared by an ISA Certified Arborist since there is more education and experience involved in this certification. The Recreation Director agreed and noted the elimination of “tree surgeon” and “landscape architect”.

Councilmember Chu asked if the Canary Island Date Palm and Mexican Fan Palm were native to Larkspur. He stated the Council was trying to protect a certain group of trees in the historic district and the designation of that area would be enough to protect those trees. He was not sure he wanted to add these non-native trees to a list that would be broadly applied.

Mayor Hartzell opened the meeting to public comments.

Ms. Sandy Blauvelt, Madrone Avenue, member of the Parks and Recreation Commission, stated Ms. Helen Heitkamp, member of the Heritage Preservation Board, feels strongly about including the palm trees as a Heritage Tree. They were planted in the 1920’s and are scattered throughout the City.

Ms. Sallyanne Wilson, Walnut Avenue, member of the Heritage Preserve Board, stated the board supports the inclusion of the palms since they are an important part of Larkspur’s history.

Councilmember Arlas asked if the proposed language had been reviewed by the City Attorney. The City Manager stated “not yet” and noted the recommendations came directly from the subcommittee. She referred to Section 12.16.050, “Heritage Trees Defined”, (A) and stated the Council could designate a particular grouping or grove of trees.

Councilmember Hillmer had questions about distinguishing different groves of trees.

Councilmember Lundstrom referred to Section 12.16.080, "Procedure for Removal of Heritage Trees", (J) which waives the permit process for pyrophytic trees and asked if the recommended permit process would have tiers or could be fast tracked. The City Manager stated the removal of a tree, whether or not it is pyrophytic, generates a lot of interest in the neighborhood. The Fire Chief has found that a tree is not pyrophytic once it is there and many of them are valued by the community. The ordinance does encourage people to avoid planting these types of trees. Councilmember Lundstrom asked if the permit could be fast tracked. The City Manager stated "no".

Councilmember Lundstrom referred to Section 12.16.080, "Procedure for Removal of Heritage Trees", (F) and had questions about the proposed changes.

The Recreation Director stated the home owner can use any specialist that they want but if the permit is contested then the City has the right to send out an a specialist chosen by staff.

Councilmember Hillmer asked if arborists were licensed or goes through a certification process. The Recreation Director stated some are certified and there are different classifications of arborists. Councilmember Chu noted his recommendation for an ISA Certified Arborist.

Mayor Hartzell opened the meeting to public comments.

Ms. Kathryn Arrow, Baltimore Avenue, stated she supported all the recommended changes. She referred to the section that defined a Heritage Tree and stated she wanted to see the Palm trees preserved but added the ordinance should specify a certain height or area of town. Not all of them need to be preserved. She referred to Section 12.16.070, "Removal or Other Actions which Severely Endanger Heritage Trees are Prohibited", and stated topping of trees should be prohibited along with the application of herbicides that would damage the tree.

She referred to the section regarding the procedure for removal of trees and stated replacement trees should be placed within five feet of the removed tree unless the removal was permitted due to property damage. No trees should be removed to allow for construction. She referred to Section 12.16.080, "Penalties for Illegal Removal" and stated this section should include the application of chemicals. The penalty should also include the suspension of a building permit for a period of three years. She asked if the City Attorney had resolved the issue regarding whether a violation would be considered a misdemeanor or a nuisance.

Mr. Rick Adler, William Avenue, stated penalties would not stop people from killing trees. The penalty should include community service. The revisions to the ordinance strengthen the punishment but should also address prevention. This could be done through education. He stated the section that pertains to consideration of the number of trees in the neighborhood should be eliminated. He stated there were many levels of “arborists”, including a Master Arborist. Noticing for meetings about the removal of trees should be posted on the Website.

Mr. James Holmes, Madrone Avenue, stated he supported the proposed changes, particularly the increase in the fine and the removal of the conflict of interest where the arborist can have economic interest in removing the tree. He referred to Section 12.16.080 (F) and stated the word “designee” should be replaced with “arborist” and in section (L) the first sentence should read “permit *application*”. He thanked staff and the Council for enhancing the ordinance.

Ms. Karen Polivy, Monte Vista Avenue, stated the ordinance defines a Heritage Tree as a tree that is 50” in circumference, 24” off the ground while other communities double the size and have half the number of trees to deal with. She had difficulty with some of the language and felt its interpretation would be problematic. She referred to Section 12.16.070 and stated the wording “more than one-fourth of the branches” should be removed since it is vague and arbitrary. She stated homeowners should not have to get a permit to maintain trees. She referred to Section 12.16.070 (B) and stated he wording “or severely endangers the tree” should be added. She stated a homeowner should be able to landscape his or her yard without the permission of the neighbors as long as they are not affecting a Heritage Tree. She referred to the discussion about a certified arborist and suggested the City ask a professional about who would be the best qualified to submit reports.

Mayor Hartzell closed the meeting to public comments.

Councilmember Arlas referred to Section 12.16.050 and stated (C) was arbitrary and should be eliminated and they should define a particular area instead. Councilmembers Chu, Lundstrom, Hillmer and Mayor Hartzell agreed. Councilmember Hillmer referred to Section 12.6.070 (A) and stated the wording about pruning more than “one-fourth of the branches within a twelve-month period” was problematic, would be difficult to enforce, and should be deleted. He was skeptical about making big changes to the existing ordinance.

Councilmember Lundstrom agreed and stated that section was unenforceable and she would like to retain the existing language with the addition of the wording “or severely endangers the tree”. She asked staff to look for internal consistency.

Councilmember Chu stated the language was vague and subjective in its existing form. The intent of the ordinance is to make sure that trees are maintained and remain in good health. He stated the ordinance is too specific.

They should cite “best practices” guidelines from the ISA or the American National Standards Institute’s Pruning Standards and anyone that goes outside of those guidelines places a tree in jeopardy.

Councilmember Arlas agreed and stated the language should be reviewed by the City Attorney. He liked the suggestion made by Councilmember Chu about citing professional standards to avoid being arbitrary. He would like to leave (A) and (B) as is.

Mayor Hartzell agreed with the suggestion made by Councilmember Chu.

Councilmember Chu referred to Section 12.16.080 (B) and stated the language related to penalties could be eliminated and a reference to Section 12.16.090 could be added.

Councilmember Hillmer referred to Section 12.16.080 (F) and stated he had a problem with the wording “pre-qualified by the City”. Councilmember Arlas stated that could be addressed by determining the level of classification that would be acceptable to the City.

Councilmember Arlas referred to Section 12.16.080 (J), “Removal of Pyrophytic Trees” and stated the City should encourage residents to create defensible space. He did not have a problem reviewing this section but those types of trees pose other hazards.

Councilmember Chu stated at the last MCCMC meeting they convened a group called the Mayors Select Committee to discuss how municipalities could adopt the 2006 International Wildland Urban Interface Code. This is a new set of standards that further increase the amount of defensible space and make other recommendations and policies. This should be treated as a separate category that is a higher priority than what is in the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

Councilmember Arlas suggested leaving this section as is and referencing the Chapter 14 of the Municipal Code and the 2006 International Wildland Urban Interface Code.

Mayor Hartzell stated the Fire Chief would still have the ability to grant an emergency permit for hazardous trees but she was not sure where that was in the code. She would like more exploration on this matter.

Councilmember Hillmer stated Health and Safety Regulations and those regarding defensible space should govern the Heritage Tree Ordinance.

Councilmember Lundstrom suggested leaving this section as is and also referencing the General Plan designated High Fire Hazard Areas.

Councilmember Hillmer referred to Section 12.16.090, "Penalties for Illegal Removal" and asked if each individual who participates in the violation would be fined \$5,000 or if they would share in the cost. He stated he received an e-mail from Ms. Mary Denton suggesting a "moratorium" on a building permit as a possible consequence to any illegal work. He thought this was worth exploring.

Councilmember Arlas stated this section would not be legally defensible and should be reviewed by the City Attorney.

Councilmember Lundstrom agreed and asked the City Attorney to also look at the wording in Section 12.16.080 (B).

Mayor Hartzell would like further review on the idea of a "building moratorium" in the event of the illegal removal of trees.

Councilmember Arlas stated he would not vote for a moratorium or a freeze on a building permit and noted it could be seen as "a taking". This punishment would be overreaching and would not work.

Councilmember Chu stated he would like an opinion from the City Attorney on this issue. The fines do not reflect the opportunity costs, especially for the developer of a large project.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated the Council should address the educational component at a future meeting.

3. PARK IMPROVEMENTS AT MAGNOLIA AVENUE PARK

The Recreation Director presented the staff report.

Councilmember Chu asked staff if they came to an agreement with Twin Cities Little League on their participation. The Recreation Director stated "not yet".

Councilmember Lundstrom asked if the connections from Alexander Avenue to Marin Primary had been worked out. Ms. Cordelia Hill stated "yes" and pointed out paths that were being improved and a new sidewalk that would lead to the Little League Field.

Mayor Hartzell asked if consideration had been given to pervious materials that would be in keeping with the concept of less runoff. She also had concerns about "stranger danger" and asked about the proposed berms. Ms. Hill stated the berms were only 2 to 3 feet high and were not contiguous. They should not pose a problem.

Mayor Hartzell opened the meeting to public comments.

Ms. Dee Freitas, West Baltimore Avenue, stated a tree was recently planted in memory of one of her neighbors and she did not see it included in the plan. The Recreation Director stated it would be protected. Ms. Freitas asked if the tree would be watered. The Recreation Director stated the plan includes an irrigation system.

Mayor Hartzell asked the landscape architect to be on the lookout during construction for a time capsule that is planted between two redwoods. It should be given to the Larkspur School District.

Mayor Hartzell closed the meeting to public comments.

M/s, Hillmer/Lundstrom and approved 5-0 to approve the park improvement plan for Magnolia Avenue Park and direct staff to seek construction bids for the project.

Councilmember Lundstrom asked about the timeline. The Public Works Director stated they would go out to bid immediately but start construction when school is out. The work should take about three months.

Councilmember Chu discussed the poor condition of the tennis courts. The Public Works Director stated there would be a separate contract for the tennis courts and they could start that work anytime.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated this was a wonderful project and she thanked everyone for the good work.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. COUNCIL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Mayor Hartzell noted the following changes in the City Council Committee Appointments: 1) Mayor Hartzell is the alternate to the Flood Zone #9 Committee; 2) Mayor Hartzell will replace Councilmember Hillmer as the representative to the Heritage Preservation Board; 3) the Larkspur/Kentfield Fire Liaison should be renamed the Larkspur/Ross Fire Liaison; 4) eliminate the Marin Community Foundation Liaison Committee; 5) eliminate the Water Transit Authority Committee.

M/s, Hillmer/Lundstrom and approved 5-0 to accept the City Council Appointments for 2008 as amended by Mayor Hartzell.

ADJOURN MEETING

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Toni DeFrancis, Recording Secretary